

## SEMIDUALIZING MODULES AND RINGS OF INVARIANTS

BILLY SANDERS

ABSTRACT. We show there exist no nontrivial semidualizing modules for nonmodular rings of invariants of order  $p^n$  with  $p$  a prime.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is concerned with the existence of nontrivial semidualizing modules. Recall

**Definition 1.1.** *A finitely generated  $S$ -module  $C$  is semidualizing if the map  $S \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(C, C)$  given by  $s \mapsto (x \mapsto sx)$  is an isomorphism and  $\text{Ext}_S^{i>0}(C, C) = 0$ .*

This is equivalent to saying  $S$  is totally  $C$  reflexive. Examples always include  $S$  and the dualizing module, if it exists, thus we call these semidualizing modules. Semidualizing modules were first discovered by Foxby in [5]. They were later rediscovered by various other authors including Vasconcelos, who called them spherical modules, and Golod, who referred to them as suitable modules. In [15], Vasconcelos asks if there exists only a finite number of nonisomorphic semidualizing modules. This question is answered in the affirmative in [3] for equicharacteristic Cohen-Macaulay algebras, and in [10] for the semilocal case. Since their discovery, semidualizing modules have been the focus of much research. See for example [1],[7],[15],[10],[9],[12], and [13].

It is natural to ask which rings have only trivial semidualizing modules. In [9], Jorgensen, Leuschke and Sather-Wagstaff give a very nice characterization of rings with a dualizing module and only trivial semidualizing modules. However, this characterization is somewhat abstract and it is difficult to tell whether the conditions hold for a particular ring. Also in [12], Sather-Wagstaff proves results relating the existence of nontrivial semidualizing modules to Bass numbers. In this paper, we pose the following question:

**Question 1.** *If a ring  $S$  has a nice (e.g. rational) singularity, then does  $S$  have only trivial semidualizing modules?*

The evidence suggests the answer is yes. In [4], Celikbas and Dao show that only trivial semidualizing modules exist over Veronese subrings, which have a quotient singularity and hence a rational singularity. Furthermore, Sather-Wagstaff shows in [11] that only trivial semidualizing modules exist for determinantal rings, which also have a rational singularity. It is proven in [13][Example 4.2.14] that all Cohen-Macaulay rings with minimal multiplicity have no nontrivial semidualizing modules. Since rational singularity and dimension 2 imply minimal multiplicity, all rings with rational singularity and dimension 2 have no nontrivial semidualizing modules. The following example shows that there are dimension 3 rings with rational singularity that do not have minimal multiplicity.

**Example 1.** *Let*

$$S = k[[x, y, z]]^{(3)} = k[[x^3, y^3, z^3, x^2y, x^2z, y^2x, y^2z, z^2x, z^2y, xyz]]$$

*which is the third Veronese subring in three variables. For the multiplicity of  $S$  to be minimal, it must equal  $\text{edim } S - \dim S + 1 = 10 - 3 + 1 = 8$ . However, setting  $\bar{S} = S/(x^3, y^3, z^3)S$ ,  $e(S) = e(\bar{S}) = \lambda(\bar{S})$  where  $\lambda$  is length. Since*

$$\bar{S} = k \oplus kx^2y \oplus kx^2z \oplus ky^2x \oplus ky^2z \oplus kz^2x \oplus kz^2y \oplus kxyz \oplus kx^2y^2z^2$$

*we thus have  $e(S) = 9$ .*

In this paper, we add to the evidence that suggests that the answer to Question 1 is yes by investigating the case where  $S$  is a ring of invariants, a large class of rings with rational singularity. The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

---

*Key words and phrases.* Rings of Invariants, Semidualizing Module.

**Theorem.** *If  $S$  is a power series ring over a field  $k$  in finitely many variables and  $G$  is a cyclic group of order  $p^l$  acting on  $S$  with  $\text{char } k \neq p$ , then  $S^G$  has only trivial semidualizing modules.*

Our approach to the proof of this result, relying on Lemma 2.1, is different than those of the results in [4] and [11]. In each of those papers, the key technique involves counting the number of generators, whereas we use Lemma 2.1. See Section 2 for a further explanation.

Section 2 gives preliminary results concerning rings of invariants and semidualizing modules and also gives a sketch of the proof. Section 3 proves a key technical theorem about when a ring has only trivial semidualizing modules, and then Section 4 uses this result to prove our main theorem.

All rings considered in this paper will be Noetherian and commutative.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, let  $S$  be a Noetherian ring. The proof relies upon the following lemma from [9].

**Lemma 2.1.** *If  $C$  is a semidualizing  $S$ -module and  $D$  is a dualizing module for  $S$ , then the homomorphism  $\eta : C \otimes \text{Hom}_S(C, D) \rightarrow D$  given by  $x \otimes \varphi \mapsto \varphi(x)$  is an isomorphism.*

The map  $\eta$  being an isomorphism is a strong condition since  $D$  is torsionless and since tensor products often have torsion elements. We will exploit this map using the following lemma from [11][Fact 2.4] and [6][Theorem 3.1].

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $C$  is a semidualizing  $S$ -module and  $S$  is a normal domain, then  $C$  is reflexive and hence an element of the class group.*

Therefore, when  $S$  is normal,  $\text{Hom}(C, D)$  is the element of the class group associated with  $C^{-1} \circ D$ , and all three modules involved in Lemma 2.1 are elements of the class group. In Theorem 3.1, with strong assumptions on  $S$ , we show that  $A \otimes B$  has torsion for any elements  $A$  and  $B$  in the class group of  $S$  which are not isomorphic to  $S$ . The construction of a torsion element is easy, however, it requires considerable work to show that this element is not zero in the tensor product. With this setup, because of Lemma 2.1 and since  $D$  does not have torsion, nontrivial semidualizing modules cannot exist. The proof also requires the following lemma which is easily proven in [13][Proposition 2.2.1].

**Lemma 2.3.** *If  $R \rightarrow S$  is a faithfully flat extension, then  $C$  is a semidualizing  $R$ -module if and only if  $C \otimes S$  is a semidualizing  $S$ -module.*

For the remainder of this paper, let  $R$  be a polynomial ring in finitely many variables over an algebraically closed field  $k$ , and let  $G$  be a finite group acting linearly on  $R$ . We shall assume that the characteristic of  $k$  does not divide the order of the group. To prove the main result, Section 4 shows that when  $|G| = p^l$  for some prime,  $R^G$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 3.1. In order to do this, we need the following definition and lemma.

**Definition 2.1.** *Given a character  $\chi : G \rightarrow k^\times$ , we denote by  $R_\chi$  the set of relative invariants, namely, the polynomials  $f \in R$  such that  $gf = \chi(g)f$ .*

Note that  $R_\chi$  is an  $R^G$ -module. The following lemma is from [2][Theorem 3.9.2].

**Lemma 2.4.** *The ring  $R^G$  is a normal domain whose class group is the subgroup  $H \subseteq \text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$  which consists of the characters that contain all the pseudoreflections in their kernel. Furthermore, for any  $\chi \in H$ , the relative invariants  $R_{\chi^{-1}}$  form the reflexive module corresponding to the element  $\chi$ .*

## 3. CLASS GROUPS

In this section, let  $S$  be a Noetherian ring. We say that an element  $\mu$  in an  $S$ -module  $M$  is indivisible if there exists no nonunit  $a \in S$  and  $\nu \in M$  such that  $\mu = a\nu$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *Suppose  $S$  is a  $k$ -algebra, with  $k$  a field and  $M$  and  $N$  are  $S$ -modules. Furthermore, suppose  $f \in M$  and  $g \in N$  are indivisible, and  $\gamma \in M$  and  $\rho \in N$  are not unit multiples of  $f$  and  $g$  respectively. If there exists  $k$ -bases  $E, F, X$  of  $M, N, S$  respectively with  $f, \gamma \in E$  and  $g, \rho \in F$  such that for every  $\xi \in X$  and  $\varepsilon \in E$  and  $\eta \in F$ ,  $\xi\varepsilon$  is a  $k$ -linear multiple of an element in  $E$  and  $\xi\eta$  is a  $k$ -linear multiple of an element of  $F$ , then  $f \otimes g - \gamma \otimes \rho$  is not zero in  $M \otimes_S N$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that such bases  $E, F, X$  exist. Let  $\mathfrak{F}$  denote the free abelian group functor. Recall that for any modules  $U$  and  $V$  over a ring  $R$ , we construct  $U \otimes_R V$  by quotienting  $\mathfrak{F}(U \cup V)$  by the submodule, which we will call  $K_{U,V}(R)$ , generated by the relations of the form

$$\begin{aligned} (v_1, u_1 + u_2) - (v_1, u_1) - (v_1, u_2) \\ (v_1 + v_2, u_1) - (v_1, u_1) - (v_2, u_1) \\ (\lambda v_1, u_1) - (v_1, \lambda u_1) \end{aligned}$$

with  $v_i \in U$ ,  $u_i \in V$  and  $\lambda \in R$ . Hence,  $M \otimes_S N \cong \mathfrak{F}(M \cup N)/K_{M,N}(S)$  and  $M \otimes_k N \cong \mathfrak{F}(M \cup N)/K_{M,N}(k)$ . Notice that, since  $k \subseteq S$ ,  $K_{M,N}(k) \subseteq K_{M,N}(S)$ . So  $M \otimes_S N$  is a quotient of  $M \otimes_k N$ . Specifically, we have the following isomorphism

$$\frac{M \otimes_k N}{K_{M,N}(S)/K_{M,N}(k)} \cong \frac{\mathfrak{F}(M \cup N)/K_{M,N}(k)}{K_{M,N}(S)/K_{M,N}(k)} \cong \frac{\mathfrak{F}(M \cup N)}{K_{M,N}(S)} \cong M \otimes_S N$$

We claim that every element of  $K_{M,N}(S)/K_{M,N}(k) \subseteq M \otimes_k N$  is of the form

$$\sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_s (\mu_s \tau_s \otimes \nu_s) - \lambda_s (\mu_s \otimes \tau_s \nu_s)$$

with  $\lambda_i \in k$ , and  $\mu_i \in E$ ,  $\nu_i \in F$ ,  $\tau_i \in X \setminus k$  and  $\lambda_i \in k$ . Take  $z \in K(S)/K(k)$ . Since the generators of  $K(S)$  of the form  $(v_1, u_1 + u_2) - (v_1, u_1) - (v_1, u_2)$  and  $(v_1 + v_2, u_1) - (v_1, u_1) - (v_2, u_1)$  are in  $K(k)$ , we may write

$$z = \sum_i (m_i t_i \otimes n_i - m_i \otimes t_i n_i)$$

with  $m_i \in M$ ,  $n_i \in N$ , and  $t_i \in S$ . However, since  $E, F, X$  are bases of  $M, N, X$  respectively, we may also write

$$m_i = \sum_j \alpha_{i,j} \mu_{i,j} \quad n_i = \sum_l \beta_{i,l} \nu_{i,l} \quad t_i = \sum_k \kappa_{i,k} \tau_{i,k}$$

with each  $\lambda_s \in k$ , and  $\mu_s \in E$ ,  $\nu_s \in F$ ,  $\tau_s \in X \setminus k$  and  $\lambda_s \in k$ . So we have

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \sum_i (m_i t_i \otimes n_i - m_i \otimes t_i n_i) \\ &= \sum_i \left( \left( \sum_j \alpha_{i,j} \mu_{i,j} \right) \left( \sum_k \kappa_{i,k} \tau_{i,k} \right) \otimes \left( \sum_l \beta_{i,l} \nu_{i,l} \right) - \left( \sum_j \alpha_{i,j} \mu_{i,j} \right) \otimes \left( \sum_k \kappa_{i,k} \tau_{i,k} \right) \left( \sum_l \beta_{i,l} \nu_{i,l} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k,l} (\alpha_{i,j} \mu_{i,j} \kappa_{i,k} \tau_{i,k} \otimes \beta_{i,l} \nu_{i,l} - \alpha_{i,j} \mu_{i,j} \otimes \kappa_{i,k} \tau_{i,k} \beta_{i,l} \nu_{i,l}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k,l} \alpha_{i,j} \beta_{i,l} \kappa_{i,k} (\mu_{i,j} \tau_{i,k} \otimes \nu_{i,l} - \mu_{i,j} \otimes \tau_{i,k} \nu_{i,l}) \\ &= \sum_{i,j,k,l} \alpha_{i,j} \beta_{i,l} \kappa_{i,k} (\mu_{i,j} \tau_{i,k} \otimes \nu_{i,l}) - \alpha_{i,j} \beta_{i,l} \kappa_{i,k} (\mu_{i,j} \otimes \tau_{i,k} \nu_{i,l}) \end{aligned}$$

Lastly, if  $\tau_{i,k}$  is in  $k$ , then  $\mu_{i,j} \tau_{i,k} \otimes \nu_{i,l} - \mu_{i,j} \otimes \tau_{i,k} \nu_{i,l}$  is already zero in  $M \otimes_k N$ . Therefore, setting  $\lambda_{i,j,k,l} = \alpha_{i,j} \beta_{i,l} \kappa_{i,k} \in k$ , the claim is shown.

Now suppose  $f \otimes g - \gamma \otimes \rho$  is zero in  $M \otimes_S N$ . Then in  $M \otimes_k N$ , we may write

$$f \otimes g - \gamma \otimes \rho = \sum_{s=1}^r \lambda_s (\mu_s \tau_s \otimes \nu_s) - \lambda_s (\mu_s \otimes \tau_s \nu_s)$$

with  $\lambda_s \in k$ , and  $\mu_s \in E$ ,  $\nu_s \in F$ ,  $\tau_s \in X \setminus k$  and  $\lambda_s \in k$ . Now  $Z = \{a \otimes b \mid a \in E, b \in F\}$  is a  $k$ -basis of  $M \otimes_k N$ . Since  $f, \gamma \in E$  and  $g, \rho \in F$ ,  $f \otimes g$  and  $\gamma \otimes \rho$  are in  $Z$ . By assumption, each  $\mu_s \tau_s \otimes \nu_s$  and  $\mu_s \otimes \tau_s \nu_s$  is a linear multiple of an element in  $Z$ . Thus,  $f \otimes g$  must be a linear multiple of either  $\mu_s \tau_s \otimes \nu_s$  or  $\mu_s \otimes \tau_s \nu_s$  for some  $s$ . But, since  $f$  and  $g$  are indivisible and for all  $s$ , neither  $\mu_s \tau_s$  nor  $\tau_s \nu_s$  is indivisible, this is a contradiction. Therefore,  $f \otimes g - \gamma \otimes \rho$  cannot be zero in  $M \otimes_S N$ .  $\square$

Take a ring  $S$  with class group  $L$  with operation  $\circ$ . Let  $T = \bigoplus_{A \in L} A$ . We can give this  $S$ -module an  $L$ -graded  $S$ -algebra structure. For any  $A, B \in L$ , recall that  $A \circ B = \text{Hom}(\text{Hom}(A \otimes_S B, S), S) \in L$ . We will define the multiplication on the homogenous elements of  $T$  with the natural map  $\varphi_{A,B} : A \otimes_S B \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\text{Hom}(A \otimes_S B, S), S)$  by setting  $ab = \varphi_{A,B}(a \otimes b)$ , for any  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ . We can extend this multiplication linearly to the nonhomogenous elements of  $T$ . Since  $S$  is contained in  $T$ , this algebra is unital, and, because  $\text{Hom}(\text{Hom}(A \otimes_S B, S), S) \cong \text{Hom}(\text{Hom}(B \otimes_S A, S), S)$ , it is commutative as well. This construction is similar to an algebra considered in [14].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $S$  be a Noetherian  $k$ -algebra, with  $k$  a field. Suppose  $L$  is finite and cyclic with generator  $\Lambda$ . Also suppose that the  $L$ -grading on  $T$  can be refined to a grading  $\Gamma$  such that every  $\Gamma$ -homogenous component is one dimensional. If there exists a  $\Gamma$ -homogenous element  $x \in \Lambda \subseteq T$  such that  $x^n \in \Lambda^n \subseteq T$  is indivisible (as an element of an  $S$ -module) for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  strictly less than  $|\Lambda|$ , then for any  $A, B \in L$  where neither  $A$  nor  $B$  is isomorphic to  $S$ , the module  $A \otimes_S B$  has torsion.*

*Proof.* Since  $\Lambda$  generates  $L$ , there exists  $a$  and  $b$  such that  $\Lambda^a = A$  and  $\Lambda^b = B$ . Then there exists  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $x^a \in A$  and  $x^b \in B$ . Since neither  $A$  nor  $B$  is isomorphic to  $S$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  are both strictly less than  $|L|$  and so  $x^a$  and  $x^b$  are indivisible. We may assume without loss of generality that  $a \geq b$ .

Let  $Q$  a minimal homogenous generating set of  $B$  which contains  $x^b$ . We may assume every element in  $Q$  is indivisible, since, by the Noetherian condition, we can replace any divisible element by an indivisible one. Since  $B$  is not isomorphic to  $S$  and is torsionless, we know that  $Q$  has another element  $y$  besides  $x^b$ . Besides being indivisible and homogeneous,  $y$  is also not a unit multiple of  $x^b$ .

Set  $z = x^a \otimes y - yx^{a-b} \otimes x^b$ . We show that  $z$  is a torsion element. Since  $x^{a-b}$  is in  $\Lambda^{a-b}$  and  $y$  is in  $B = \Lambda^b$ ,  $yx^{a-b}$  is  $\Lambda^a$  which is  $A$ . Thus  $z$  is in  $A \otimes_S B$ . Furthermore, for any  $f \in (A \circ B)^{-1}$  we have  $x^a y f, x^{a+b} f \in S$ . Thus we have,

$$(x^a y f)z = x^{2a} y f \otimes y - yx^{a-b} \otimes x^{a+b} y f = x^{2a} y f \otimes y - x^{2a} y f \otimes y = 0$$

Thus to show that  $z$  is a torsion element, it suffices to show that  $z$  is not zero in  $A \otimes_S B$ .

Note that, by construction,  $x^a$  and  $y$  are indivisible, and since  $y$  and  $x^b$  are not unit multiples of each other, neither are  $x^a$  and  $yx^{a-b}$ . Also  $yx^{a-b}$  is homogenous since  $x^{a-b}$  is. We can choose  $\Gamma$ -homogenous bases  $E$  and  $F$  of  $A$  and  $B$  respectively such that  $x^a, y \in E$  and  $x^a, yx^{a-b} \in F$ . Similarly we can choose a  $\Gamma$ -homogenous basis  $X$  of  $S$ . Since every  $\Gamma$ -homogenous component of  $T$  is one dimensional, for every  $\xi \in X$  and  $\varepsilon \in E$  and  $\eta \in F$ ,  $\xi\varepsilon$  is a linear multiple of an element in  $E$  and  $\xi\eta$  is a linear multiple of an element of  $F$ . Thus  $z$  meets the hypotheses of the previous proposition. Therefore,  $z$  is not zero in  $A \otimes_S B$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.1.** *Assume the set up of the last Theorem and that  $S$  has a dualizing module. Then  $S$  has no nontrivial semidualizing modules.*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be a semidualizing module for  $S$ . Then  $C \otimes \text{Hom}(C, D) \cong D$  where  $D$  is a dualizing module. However,  $\text{Hom}(C, D) \cong C^{-1} \circ D$  is also an element of the class group. Thus by the previous theorem, since  $D$  is torsionless, either  $C$  or  $\text{Hom}(C, D)$  is isomorphic to  $S$ . Therefore,  $C$  is isomorphic to  $S$  or  $D$ .  $\square$

#### 4. SEMIDUALIZING MODULES OF RINGS OF INVARIANTS

Let  $R$  be the polynomial ring in  $d$  variables over  $k$ . We can apply the previous results to the semidualizing modules over rings of invariants for a certain cyclic group, but first we need a lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Assume  $k$  is an algebraically closed field. If  $G$  is a finite cyclic group acting linearly on  $R$  generated by  $g$  whose order is not divisible by the characteristic of  $k$ , then there exist algebraically independent  $x_1, \dots, x_d \in R$  such that  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_d]$  and  $gx_i = \zeta^{n_i} x_i$  with  $\zeta \in k$  a primitive  $|G|$ th root of unity.*

*Proof.* By putting  $g$  in the Jordan canonical form, it is an easy exercise to see that  $g$  is diagonalizable since  $|G|$  and  $\text{char } k$  are coprime. Thus, we may choose an eigenbasis,  $x_1, \dots, x_d$ , of  $R_1$ . So,  $gx_i = \xi_i x_i$  with  $\xi_i \in k$ . Since  $g^{|G|}$  should act as the identity, each  $\xi_i$  must be a  $|G|$ th root of unity, and so we may write  $\xi_i = \zeta^{n_i}$  where  $\zeta$  is some fixed primitive  $|G|$ th root of unity. Also,  $R$  is isomorphic to the symmetric algebra of  $R_1$  which is a polynomial ring in the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_d$ . Hence,  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  are algebraically independent.  $\square$

To apply the results of Section 3, we will observe that in this case

$$T = \bigoplus_{\chi \in L} R_{\chi^{-1}} \subseteq R$$

where  $L$  is the class group of  $R^G$ . The desired grading  $\Gamma$  of  $T$  will be the monomial grading with respect to the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  defined in the previous lemma. Before we proceed however, we need to show that this grading is a refinement of  $L$ , to which end, the following lemma suffices.

**Lemma 4.2.** *If  $G$  consists of diagonal matrices, then for any character  $\chi : G \rightarrow k^\times$ , the set of all monomials in  $R_\chi$  is a  $k$ -basis.*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be the set of all monomials of  $R_\chi$ . Since any distinct monomials are linearly independent,  $X$  is linearly independent. Take any  $g \in G$ . Then for each  $i$ ,  $gx_i = \lambda_i x_i$  with  $\lambda_i \in k$ . So for any  $\underline{x}^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d}$  in  $R$ , we have

$$g\underline{x}^\alpha = gx_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots gx_d^{\alpha_d} = (\lambda_1 x_1)^{\alpha_1} \cdots (\lambda_d x_d)^{\alpha_d} = \underline{\lambda} x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d} = \underline{\lambda} \underline{x}^\alpha$$

with  $\underline{\lambda} = \lambda_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \lambda_d^{\alpha_d}$ . Take any  $f \in R_\chi$ . We may write  $f = \kappa_1 \underline{x}^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + \kappa_m \underline{x}^{\alpha_m}$ . On the one hand, we know that

$$gf = g(\kappa_1 \underline{x}^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + \kappa_m \underline{x}^{\alpha_m}) = g\kappa_1 \underline{x}^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + g\kappa_m \underline{x}^{\alpha_m} = \kappa_1 \underline{\lambda}_1 \underline{x}^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + \kappa_m \underline{\lambda}_m \underline{x}^{\alpha_m}$$

with  $\underline{\lambda}_i = \lambda_1^{\alpha_{1i}} \cdots \lambda_d^{\alpha_{di}}$ . By virtue of  $f$  being in  $R_\chi$ , we also know that

$$gf = \chi(g)f = \chi(g)\kappa_1 \underline{x}^{\alpha_1} + \cdots + \chi(g)\kappa_m \underline{x}^{\alpha_m}$$

However, since monomials are linearly independent, this means that for each  $i$ ,  $\kappa_i \underline{\lambda}_i = \chi(g)\kappa_i$ , and so  $\underline{\lambda}_i = \chi(g)$ . Therefore, for each  $i$ ,  $\underline{x}^{\alpha_i}$  is in  $R_\chi$  and thus also in  $X$ . Hence,  $X$  spans  $R_\chi$  and is a basis.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.1.** *Suppose  $S$  is a power series ring over a field  $k$  in  $d$  variables and  $G$  is a cyclic group of order  $n$  acting on  $R$  with  $\text{char } k$  not dividing  $n$ . If  $g$  generates  $G$  and has a primitive  $n$ th root of unity as an eigenvalue, then  $S^G$  has only trivial semidualizing modules.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3, since  $\bar{k} \otimes S^G$  is a faithfully flat extension of  $S^G$ ,  $C$  is a semidualizing  $S^G$ -module if and only if  $\bar{k} \otimes_{S^G} C$  is a semidualizing  $\bar{k} \otimes S^G$ -module. Thus, if there are no nontrivial semidualizing modules for  $\bar{k} \otimes S^G$ , then there are none for  $S^G$ . So, we may assume that  $k$  is algebraically closed.

Since  $G$  is cyclic and is generated by  $g$ , a character in  $\text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$  is completely determined by the image of  $g$ . However,  $g$  can only be sent to an  $n$ th root of unity. Since  $k$  is algebraically closed, and since  $\text{char } k$  does not divide  $n$ , there are  $n$  distinct  $n$ th roots of unity, which form a cyclic group. Therefore,  $G$  is isomorphic to  $\text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$ . Since class group of  $R^G$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$ , this means the class group must be cyclic.

By the previous lemma, we may write  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_d]$  where  $gx_i = \zeta^{\eta_i} x_i$  with  $\zeta \in k$  a primitive  $|G|$ th root of unity. The assumption tells us that we may assume that  $\eta_1 = 0$ . Define  $\chi : G \rightarrow k^\times$  by  $g \mapsto \zeta^{-1}$ . Since  $\zeta^{-1}$  is a primitive  $|G|$ th root of unity,  $\chi$  generates  $\text{Hom}(G, k^\times)$ . So, for some  $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\chi^\lambda$  generates the class group  $L$ . Assume that  $\lambda$  is as small as possible. Note that  $gx_1^\lambda = (\zeta x_1)^\lambda = \zeta^\lambda x_1^\lambda$ , and so  $x_1^\lambda \in R_{\chi^{-\lambda}}$ , the reflexive module corresponding to  $\chi^\lambda$ . Since we have chosen  $\lambda$  to be as small as possible,  $|\chi^\lambda| = n/\lambda$ . Thus, for each  $1 \leq \nu < |\chi^{-\lambda}| = n/\lambda$ ,  $\lambda\nu$  is strictly less than  $n$ . Since the smallest power of  $x_1$  that is invariant is  $n$ , this means that  $(x_1^\lambda)^\nu$  is indivisible. Therefore, using the monomial grading, the conditions of Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, and thus  $R^G$  has no nontrivial semidualizing modules. Since  $S^G$  is the completion of  $R^G$ , and completion is faithfully flat, we are done by Lemma 2.3.  $\square$

We can recover the non modular case of [4, Corollary 3.21].

**Corollary 4.1.** *There exists no semidualizing modules over nonmodular Veronese subrings.*

*Proof.* Let  $g$  be an  $d \times d$  diagonal matrix whose entries are all  $\zeta_n$ , a primitive  $n$ th root of unity. Then the  $n$ -Veronese subring in  $d$  variables is  $R = k[[x_1, \dots, x_d]]^G$  where  $G$  is the group generated by  $g$ . Since the order of  $G$  is  $n$ , the result follows from the previous proposition.  $\square$

We now come to our main theorem.

**Theorem 4.1.** *If  $S$  is a power series ring over a field  $k$  in finitely many variables and  $G$  is a cyclic group of order  $p^l$  acting on  $S$  with  $\text{char } k \neq p$ , then  $S^G$  has only trivial semidualizing modules.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1, we may write  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_d]$  where  $gx_i = \zeta^{\eta_i} x_i$  with  $\zeta \in k$  a primitive  $|G|$ th root of unity. We may assume that  $\zeta^{\eta_1}$  has the greatest order of all the  $\zeta^{\eta_i}$  and set  $z = |\zeta^{\eta_1}|$ . Since  $|\zeta^{\eta_i}|$  is a power of  $p$  less than  $z$ , we have  $|\zeta^{\eta_i}|$  divides  $z$  for each  $i$ , and so  $(\zeta^{\eta_i})^z = 1$ . Thus, viewing  $g$  as a diagonal matrix with entries  $\zeta^{\eta_i}$ ,  $g^z$  is the identity, and so  $n \leq z$ . But,  $z$  has to be less than  $n$ , giving us equality. Hence,  $\zeta^{\eta_1}$  is a primitive  $n$ th root of unity. However, since our choice of  $\zeta$  is arbitrary, we may assume that  $\eta_1 = 1$ . In short, we have  $gx_1 = \zeta x_1$ . The result follows from the previous proposition.  $\square$

The proofs of Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.1 show that Theorem 3.1 applies to the class of rings under consideration. Thus we actually have the following result, which resolves in the affirmative a special case of Conjecture 1.3 in [8].

**Corollary 4.2.** *Assume the set up of the previous theorem, and let  $D$  be a dualizing module for  $S$ . If  $M$  is a reflexive module of rank 1 and  $M \otimes_S \text{Hom}_S(M, D)$  is torsionfree, then  $M$  is isomorphic to either  $S$  or  $D$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $M$  and  $\text{Hom}_S(M, D)$  are both elements of the class group, and since Theorem 3.1 applies, either  $M$  or  $\text{Hom}(M, D)$  is isomorphic to  $S$ . In the latter case implies that  $M \cong D$ .  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks Sean Sather-Wagstaff and Hailong Dao for their useful insights. The author would also like to thank the referee for their very helpful comments.

#### REFERENCES

1. Tokuji Araya and Ryo Takahashi, *A generalization of a theorem of Foxby*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **93** (2009), no. 2, 123–127. MR 2534419 (2010h:13025)
2. D. J. Benson, *Polynomial invariants of finite groups*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 190, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR 1249931 (94j:13003)
3. Lars Winther Christensen and Sean Sather-Wagstaff, *A Cohen-Macaulay algebra has only finitely many semidualizing modules*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **145** (2008), no. 3, 601–603. MR 2464778 (2009m:13034)
4. Hailong Dao and Olgur Celikbas, *Necessary conditions for the depth formula over cohen-macaulay local rings*, (2011), arXiv:1008.2573.
5. Hans-Bjørn Foxby, *Gorenstein modules and related modules*, Math. Scand. **31** (1972), 267–284 (1973). MR 0327752 (48 #6094)
6. A. Gerko, *On the structure of the set of semidualizing complexes*, Illinois J. Math. **48** (2004), no. 3, 965–976. MR 2114263 (2005h:13026)
7. A. A. Gerko, *Homological dimensions and semidualizing complexes*, Sovrem. Mat. Prilozh. (2005), no. 30, Algebra, 3–30. MR 2464547 (2009m:13020)
8. Shiro Goto, Ryo Takahashi, Naoki Taniguchi, and Hoang Le Truong, *Huneke-wiegand conjecture and change of rings*, (2013), arXiv:1305.4238v2.
9. David A. Jorgensen, Graham J. Leuschke, and Sean Sather-Wagstaff, *Presentations of rings with non-trivial semidualizing modules*, Collect. Math. **63** (2012), no. 2, 165–180. MR 2909823
10. Saeed Nasseh and Sean Sather-Wagstaff, *A local ring has only finitely many semidualizing complexes up to shift-isomorphism*, (2012), arXiv:1201.0037.
11. Sean Sather-Wagstaff, *Semidualizing modules and the divisor class group*, Illinois J. Math. **51** (2007), no. 1, 255–285. MR 2346197 (2009c:13022)
12. ———, *Bass numbers and semidualizing complexes*, Commutative algebra and its applications, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2009, pp. 349–381. MR 2640315 (2011d:13012)
13. ———, *Semidualizing modules*, (2009), <http://www.ndsu.edu/pubweb/ssatherw/DOCS/han.pdf>.
14. Masataka Tomari and Keichi Watanabe, *Normal  $\mathbb{Z}_r$ -graded rings and normal cyclic covers*, Manuscripta Math. **76** (1992), no. 3-4, 325–340. MR 1185023 (93j:13002)
15. Wolmer V. Vasconcelos, *Divisor theory in module categories*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1974, North-Holland Mathematics Studies, No. 14, Notas de Matemática No. 53. [Notes on Mathematics, No. 53]. MR 0498530 (58 #16637)